

Contractions: Nijenhuis and Saletan tensors for general algebraic structures

José F. Cariñena

Departamento de Física Teórica, Univ. de Zaragoza

50.009 Zaragoza, Spain

e-mail: jfc@posta.unizar.es

Janusz Grabowski*

Institute of Mathematics, Warsaw University

ul. Banacha 2, 02-097 Warszawa, Poland.

and

Mathematical Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences

ul. Śniadeckich 8, P. O. Box 137, 00-950 Warszawa, Poland

e-mail: jgrab@mimuw.edu.pl

Giuseppe Marmo[†]

Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università Federico II di Napoli

and

INFN, Sezione di Napoli

Complesso Universitario di Monte Sant'Angelo

Via Cintia, 80126 Napoli, Italy

e-mail: marmo@na.infn.it

February 1, 2008

Abstract

In this note we study generalizations in many directions of the contraction procedure for Lie algebras introduced by Saletan [Sa]. We consider products of arbitrary nature, not necessarily Lie brackets, and we generalize to infinite dimension, considering a modification of the approach by Nijenhuis tensors to bilinear operations on sections of finite-dimensional vector bundles. We apply our general procedure to Lie algebras, Lie algebroids, and Poisson brackets. We present also results on contractions of n -ary products and coproducts.

*Supported by KBN, grant No. 2 P03A 031 17.

[†]Supported by PRIN SINTESI.

1 Introduction

For a general (real) topological algebra, i.e., a topological vector space \mathcal{A} over \mathbb{R} (but other topological fields, like \mathbb{C} , can be considered in a similar way as well) with a continuous bilinear operation

$$\mu : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}, \quad (X, Y) \mapsto X * Y, \quad (1)$$

one considers contraction procedures as follows.

If $U(\lambda) : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is a family of linear morphisms which continuously depends on the parameter $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ from a neighbourhood \mathcal{U} of 0 and $U(\lambda)$ are invertible for $\lambda \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{0\}$, then we can consider the continuous family of products $X *^\lambda Y$ defined by

$$X *^\lambda Y = U(\lambda)^{-1}(U(\lambda)(X) * U(\lambda)(Y)), \quad (2)$$

for $\lambda \in \mathcal{U} \setminus \{0\}$. All these products are isomorphic by definition, since

$$U(\lambda)(X *^\lambda Y) = U(\lambda)(X) * U(\lambda)(Y) \quad (3)$$

and if $N = U(0)$ is invertible, then clearly

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} X *^\lambda Y = N^{-1}(N(X) * N(Y)). \quad (4)$$

But sometimes, the limit $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} X *^\lambda Y$ may exist for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ even if N is not invertible and (4) does not make sense. We say then that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} X *^\lambda Y$ is a *contraction* of the product $X * Y$. Of course, the problem of existence and the form of the contracted product heavily depends on the family $U(\lambda)$. In [Sa] this problem has been solved for linear families $U(\lambda) = \lambda I + N$ and \mathcal{A} – a finite-dimensional Lie algebra.

Here we study generalizations in various directions of the contraction procedure introduced by Saletan [Sa]. First of all, we consider products of arbitrary nature, not necessarily Lie brackets. Second, we generalize to infinite dimension, considering a modification of the approach by Nijenhuis tensors to bilinear operations on sections of finite-dimensional vector bundles. The motivation stems from physics, since infinite-dimensional algebras of sections of some bundles arise frequently as models both in Classical and Quantum Physics. In particular, we were confronted with this problem within the framework of Quantum Bihamiltonian Systems [CGM]. According to Dirac [Di], a "quantum Poisson bracket" necessarily arises from the associative product on the space of operators. Similarly, by Ado's theorem, any finite-dimensional Lie algebra arises as an algebra of matrices. It is therefore quite natural to investigate contractions of associative algebras along with contractions of Lie algebras and their generalizations to Lie algebroids. We concentrate mainly on smooth sections, but this particular choice plays no definite role in our approach.

The paper is organized as follows. In the next section we present the general scheme we are working with and the main result (Theorem 2) on contractions for algebras of sections of vector bundles. We make some remarks on contractions with respect to more general linear families $U(\lambda) = \lambda A + N$.

Section 3 is devoted to examples and Section 4 to more detailed studies of hierarchies of contractions. We develop an algebraic technique which allows us to produce much simpler proofs of facts about hierarchies than those available in the literature.

In Section 5 we comment on the behaviour of algebraic properties under contractions.

Contractions of Lie algebras and Lie algebroids, as particular cases of our general procedure, are studied in Sections 6 and 7.

In Section 8 we use our knowledge on contractions of Lie algebroids to define contractions of Poisson structures. The approach is very natural and leads to structures very similar (but slightly different) to those which are known under the name of Poisson-Nijenhuis structures (cf. [MM, KSM]).

We end up with observations on contractions of n -ary products and coproducts.

2 Linear contractions of products on sections of vector bundles

Let us assume that E is a smooth vector bundle with fibers of dimension n_0 , over a smooth manifold M . Denote by $*$ a bilinear operation $\mu : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$,

$$\mu : (X, Y) \in \mathcal{A} \otimes \mathcal{A} \mapsto X * Y \in \mathcal{A} ,$$

on the space of smooth sections of E which is, at least point-wise, continuous. In practice, we shall deal with local products, therefore being defined by bilinear differential operators. We shall use both notations for the product according to which one is more convenient when treating particular cases.

Let $N : E \rightarrow E$ be a smooth vector bundle morphism over id_M . One refers also to N as to a (1,1)-tensor field, i.e., a section of $E^* \otimes E$. Since $N_p : E_p \rightarrow E_p$ is a morphism of the finite-dimensional vector space E_p , where E_p denotes the fiber over the point $p \in M$, we have the Riesz decomposition $E_p = E_p^1 \oplus E_p^2$ into invariant subspaces of N_p in such a way that N_p is invertible on E_p^1 and nilpotent of order q on E_p^2 , i.e., $N^q(X_p) = 0$, for $X_p \in E_p^2$. One can take $E_p^1 = \tilde{N}_p(E_p)$, $E_p^2 = \ker \tilde{N}_p$, where $\tilde{N}_p = (N_p)^{n_0}$, with $n_0 = \dim E_p$. In this way we get the decomposition $E = E^1 \oplus E^2$ of the vector bundle E into two supplementary generalized distributions. Note that the dimension of E_p^1 may vary from point to point. Nevertheless, E^1 is a smooth distribution, i.e., it is generated locally by a finite number of smooth sections of E . Indeed, if $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n_0}\}$ is a local basis of smooth sections of E , then $\{\tilde{N}(e_1), \dots, \tilde{N}(e_{n_0})\}$ is a set of local smooth sections generating locally E^1 .

Theorem 1 *The (generalized) distribution E^2 is smooth if and only if it is regular, i.e., of constant rank: $\dim E_p^2 = \text{const}$.*

Proof.- Since the rank of a smooth distribution is semi-continuous from above:

$$\liminf_{p \rightarrow p_0} \dim E_p^2 \geq \dim E_{p_0}^2 , \quad (5)$$

and the complementary distribution E^1 is smooth, so that

$$\limsup_{p \rightarrow p_0} \dim E_p^2 \leq \dim E_{p_0}^2 , \quad (6)$$

we see that both conditions (5) and (6) are satisfied if and only if E^2 is of constant rank.

Conversely, if E^2 is of constant rank, say $n_0 - l$, take a basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_{n_0}\}$ of smooth local sections of E such that the elements of $\{\tilde{N}(e_1), \dots, \tilde{N}(e_l)\}$ span E_p^1 . Then $\{\tilde{N}(e_1), \dots, \tilde{N}(e_l)\}$ is a basis of local sections of E^1 near $p \in M$. Write

$$\tilde{N}(e_i) = \sum_{j=1}^l f_{ij} \tilde{N}(e_j) .$$

Then the functions f_{ij} are smooth and the smooth sections

$$\tilde{e}_i = e_i - \sum_{j=1}^l f_{ij} e_j , \quad i = l+1, \dots, n_0 ,$$

span locally E^2 . Indeed, $\tilde{N}(\tilde{e}_i) = 0$ and the elements \tilde{e}_i , for $i = l+1, \dots, n_0$, are linearly independent. \square

Note that in general no one of the distributions E^1 and E^2 has to be “involutive” in the sense that smooth sections of E^1 (resp. E^2) are closed with respect to the composition law $*$.

Consider now a new (1,1)-tensor $U(\lambda) = \lambda I + N$ depending on a real parameter λ . Since the spectrum of N is finite and continuously depends on p , in a sufficiently small neighbourhood of p all of $U(\lambda)_p$ are invertible for sufficiently small λ , but $\lambda \neq 0$. Thus, we can locally define, for $\lambda \neq 0$, a new operation

$$\begin{aligned} X *_{\lambda}^N Y &= U(\lambda)^{-1}(U(\lambda)(X) * U(\lambda)(Y)) \\ &= U(\lambda)^{-1}((\lambda X + N(X)) * (\lambda Y + N(Y))) \\ &= U(\lambda)^{-1}(\lambda^2 X * Y + \lambda(N(X) * Y + X * N(Y)) + N(X) * N(Y)) . \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

We would like to find conditions assuring that the limit

$$X *_N Y = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} X *_{\lambda}^N Y$$

exists for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ and find the corresponding contraction $X *_N Y$.

Using the identity $U(\lambda)^{-1}(\lambda I + N) = I$, i.e.,

$$U(\lambda)^{-1}(\lambda X) = X - U(\lambda)^{-1}N(X) ,$$

we get from (7) that

$$\begin{aligned} X *_{\lambda}^N Y &= \lambda X * Y + (N(X) * Y + X * N(Y) - N(X * Y)) \\ &+ U(\lambda)^{-1}(N(X) * N(Y) - N(N(X) * Y + X * N(Y) - N(X * Y))) . \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Denoting

$$\delta_N \mu(X, Y) = X \tilde{*}_N Y = N(X) * Y + X * N(Y) - N(X * Y) ,$$

and by $T_N \mu(X, Y)$ – the *Nijenhuis torsion* of N :

$$T_N \mu(X, Y) = N(X) * N(Y) - N(X \tilde{*}_N Y) ,$$

we can rewrite (8) in the form

$$X *_N^\lambda Y = \lambda X * Y + X \widetilde{*}_N Y + U(\lambda)^{-1} T_N \mu(X, Y) .$$

Hence, the limit

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} X *_N^\lambda Y$$

exists if and only if

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} U(\lambda)^{-1} T_N \mu(X, Y) \quad \text{exists for every } X, Y \in \mathcal{A} . \quad (9)$$

Denote by $\mathcal{A}^1, \mathcal{A}^2$, the spaces of smooth sections of E^1 and E^2 , respectively. Of course, in general $\mathcal{A} \neq \mathcal{A}^1 \oplus \mathcal{A}^2$. We may have $\mathcal{A}^2 = \{0\}$ even in the case $E^2 \neq \{0\}$. Since E^1 and E^2 are invariant distributions of $U(\lambda)$, hence of $U(\lambda)^{-1}$, the existence of the limit (9) may be checked separately on the corresponding parts of $T_N \mu$. On E^2 the tensor N is nilpotent, so for $X_p \in E_p^2$,

$$(\lambda I + N)_p^{-1}(X_p) = (\lambda(I - (-N/\lambda)))_p^{-1}(X_p) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(-\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^n N_p^n(X_p) , \quad (10)$$

where the sum is in fact finite, and

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \sum_{n=0}^{q-1} \frac{(-1)^n}{\lambda^{n+1}} N_p^n(X_p)$$

exists if and only if $X_p = 0$. Thus, a necessary condition for existence of the limit (9) is that $T_N \mu(X, Y) \in \mathcal{A}^1$ for every $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$.

Since on E^1 the tensor N is invertible, we have clearly

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} (\lambda I + N)^{-1} = N^{-1}$$

on E^1 , so that, assuming $T_N \mu(X, Y) \in \mathcal{A}^1$,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} U(\lambda)^{-1} T_N \mu(X, Y) = N^{-1} T_N \mu(X, Y) = \tau_N \mu(X, Y) .$$

Here $\tau_N \mu(X, Y) = N^{-1} T_N \mu(X, Y)$ is the unique section of E^1 determined by the condition

$$N(\tau_N \mu(X, Y)) = T_N \mu(X, Y) .$$

In order to get a new product on \mathcal{A} we have to assume that $\tau_N \mu(X, Y)$ is smooth, which is *a priori* not automatic, even if we have $T_N \mu(X, Y) \in \mathcal{A}^1$. Note that if N is regular, i.e., E^1 is of constant dimension, then, as we shall show in Theorem 3, $N(\mathcal{A}^1) = \mathcal{A}^1$ and $\tau_N \mu(X, Y)$ is smooth automatically.

Let us summarize the above as follows:

Theorem 2 *Let $\mu : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a point-wise continuous bilinear product of smooth sections of a vector bundle E over a manifold M (we will write also $X * Y$ instead of $\mu(X, Y)$) and let $N : E \rightarrow E$ be a smooth $(1,1)$ -tensor. Denote by $U(\lambda) = \lambda I + N$ a*

deformation of N , by $E = E^1 \oplus E^2$ the Riesz decomposition of E relative to N , and by \mathcal{A}^1 the set of smooth sections of E^1 . Then, the limit

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} U(\lambda)^{-1}(U(\lambda)(X) * U(\lambda)(Y))$$

exists for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ and defines a new (contracted) bilinear operation

$$D_N \mu(X, Y) = X *_N Y$$

on \mathcal{A} if and only if the Nijenhuis torsion

$$T_N \mu(X, Y) = N(X) * N(Y) - N(N(X) * Y + X * N(Y)) + N^2(X * Y)$$

takes values in $N(\mathcal{A}^1)$. If this is the case, then

$$X *_N Y = X \tilde{*}_N Y + \tau_N \mu(X, Y) , \quad (11)$$

where $X \tilde{*}_N Y$ is a new bilinear operation $\delta_N \mu$ on \mathcal{A} defined by

$$\delta_N \mu = X \tilde{*}_N Y = N(X) * Y + X * N(Y) - N(X * Y) ,$$

and $\tau_N \mu(X, Y) = N^{-1} T_N \mu(X, Y)$ is the unique section of \mathcal{A}^1 such that

$$N(\tau_N \mu(X, Y)) = T_N \mu(X, Y) .$$

Moreover, N constitutes a homomorphism of (\mathcal{A}, μ_N) into (\mathcal{A}, μ) :

$$N(X *_N Y) = N(X) * N(Y) .$$

Remark. Let us note that our procedure is not just applying the finite-dimensional linear one to every fiber, since the operation $*$ need not act fiber-wise. Also, this is not direct application to infinite-dimensional algebra \mathcal{A} , since we have not, in general, the Riesz decomposition $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_1 \oplus \mathcal{A}_2$ with respect to N . On the other hand, the whole procedure can be applied directly to infinite-dimensional cases for which we are given the Riesz decomposition of N .

Definition 1 The tensor N satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 2, i.e., such that $T_N \mu$ takes values in $N(\mathcal{A}^1)$, will be called a Saletan tensor. If N^k is a Saletan tensor for every $k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, then N will be called a strong Saletan tensor. In the case $T_N \mu = 0$ we shall call N a Nijenhuis tensor.

Remark. It is obvious from the proof of Theorem 2 that Nijenhuis tensors define contractions even in the case of infinite-dimensional algebras \mathcal{A} without any assumption that \mathcal{A} consists of sections of a finite-dimensional vector bundle. Indeed, with $T_N \mu = 0$ we have no obstructions, the Riesz decomposition is irrelevant, and $X *_N Y = X \tilde{*}_N Y$. Of course,

$$(\text{Nijenhuis}) \Rightarrow (\text{strong Saletan}) \Rightarrow (\text{Saletan}).$$

We shall call N regular, if E^1 (hence also E^2) is of constant rank. This is always the case when E is a bundle over a single point, i.e., $E = \mathcal{A}$.

Theorem 3 *In the regular case, i.e., when E^1 is of constant rank, $N(\mathcal{A}^1) = \mathcal{A}^1$, so that N is a Saletan tensor if and only if $T_N\mu(X, Y)$ takes values in \mathcal{A}^1 .*

Remark. We shall prove a stronger result in Theorem 6.

Proof.- Indeed, according to Theorem 1, both E^1 and E^2 are smooth distributions. Locally we have a basis of smooth sections of E^1 , and N acts on this basis as invertible matrix of smooth functions. Indeed, since regularity of E^1 implies that there is a local basis $\{e_1, \dots, e_l\}$ of sections of E^1 , in this basis N acts simply as invertible matrix of smooth functions (f_{ij}) , so for $X = \sum g_i e_i$,

$$N \left(\sum_{i=1}^l h_i e_i \right) = X,$$

where the smooth functions h_i are defined by

$$\sum_{j=1}^l f_{ij} h_j = g_i .$$

Hence, $N^{-1}(X)$ is locally, thus globally, smooth section of E^1 for any smooth section X of E^1 . \square

Remark. For a fiber bundle over a single point Theorem 2 gives exactly the Saletan result [Sa] in case μ is a Lie bracket. Saletan writes $X *_N Y$ in the form

$$X *_N Y = (X \widetilde{*}_N Y)_2 + N^{-1}((N(X) * N(Y))_1) , \quad (12)$$

where $X = X_1 + X_2$ is the decomposition of $X \in \mathcal{A}$ into sections of E^1 and E^2 . Of course, (12) is formally the same as (11) for the decomposition into sections of E^1 and E^2 . However, in general the summands of the right hand side of (12) are not smooth, while the decomposition (11) is into smooth parts. In the regular case both formulae coincide.

Theorem 4 (a) *Theorem 2 remains valid when we consider the family $U(\lambda)$ in a slightly more general form: $U(\lambda) = \lambda I + f(\lambda) N$, where f is continuous and $f(0) = 1$.*

(b) *If we consider instead of $U(\lambda)$ the family $U_1(\lambda) = \lambda A + N$, then the contraction procedure for $U_1(\lambda)$ and the product $*$ is equivalent to the contraction procedure of the above type for a new N and a new product. In particular, if A is invertible, we get our standard contraction for $A^{-1}N$ and the product $X *_A Y = A^{-1}(A(X) * A(Y))$. In other words, the contraction procedure for the family $U_1(\lambda) = \lambda A + N$ can be reduced to the contraction described in Theorem 2.*

Proof.-

(a) Let us write $U(\lambda) = \frac{U_1(\varepsilon)}{f(\lambda)}$, where $U_1(\varepsilon) = \varepsilon I + N$ and $\varepsilon = \frac{\lambda}{f(\lambda)}$, so that $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ is equivalent to $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Since

$$U(\lambda)^{-1}(U(\lambda)(X) * U(\lambda)(Y)) = \frac{1}{f(\lambda)} U_1(\varepsilon)^{-1}(U_1(\varepsilon)(X) * U_1(\varepsilon)(Y)) \quad (13)$$

and $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} f(\lambda) = 1$, both contraction procedures are equivalent.

(b) Assume first that A is invertible. Since $\lambda A + N = A(\lambda I + A^{-1}N)$, we can use Theorem 2 for $N := A^{-1}N$ and the product $*_A$. In fact, we can skip the assumption that A is invertible. For, take λ_0 for which $A + \lambda_0 N$ is invertible. Then, we write

$$U(\lambda) = \lambda A + N = (A + \lambda_0 N) (\lambda I + (1 - \lambda \lambda_0)(A + \lambda_0 N)^{-1}N), \quad (14)$$

and we can proceed as before and using (a) of the Theorem. \square

3 Examples

Many interesting physical applications are based on the idea of contraction by İnönü and Wigner [IW]. We will call a smooth distribution E^1 in the vector bundle E *involutive* if the space \mathcal{A}^1 of sections of E^1 is closed with respect to the product $*$, i.e., \mathcal{A}^1 is a subalgebra of \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 5 *Let E^1 be a smooth regular and involutive distribution in E . Take E^2 to be any supplementary smooth distribution and let $N = P_{E^1}$ be the projection on E^1 along E^2 . Then N is a Saletan tensor which is Nijenhuis if and only if E^2 is also involutive. The contracted product reads*

$$X *_N Y = X_1 * Y_1 + (X_1 * Y_2 + X_2 * Y_1)_2, \quad (15)$$

where $X = X_1 + X_2$, etc., is the decomposition with respect to the splitting $E = E^1 \oplus E^2$.

Proof.- It is obvious that the Nijenhuis tensor $T_N(X, Y) = N(X) * N(Y) - N(X \widetilde{*}_N Y)$ takes values in \mathcal{A}^1 , since E^1 is involutive. Due to regularity, the corresponding contraction exists (Theorem 3). It is easy to see that

$$X \widetilde{*}_N Y = X_1 * Y_1 + (X_1 * Y_2 + X_2 * Y_1)_2 - (X_2 * Y_2)_1. \quad (16)$$

Hence, $T_N(X, Y) = \tau_N(X, Y) = (X_2 * Y_2)_1$, so that N is a Nijenhuis tensor if and only if E^2 is also involutive. Finally,

$$X *_N Y = X \widetilde{*}_N Y + \tau_N(X, Y) = X_1 * Y_1 + (X_1 * Y_2 + X_2 * Y_1)_2. \quad (17)$$

\square

Example 1. Consider a manifold M with two foliations $\mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2$ corresponding to a splitting into complementary distributions $TM = E^1 \oplus E^2$. The projection N of TM onto E^1 along E^2 is a Nijenhuis tensor (Theorem 5). The contracted bracket is trivial for two vector fields which are tangent to \mathcal{F}_2 , it is the standard one for two vector fields which are tangent to \mathcal{F}_1 and it is the projection onto E^2 of the standard bracket of two vector fields of which one belongs to \mathcal{F}_1 and the second to \mathcal{F}_2 .

Example 2. Let E be just 1-dimensional trivial bundle over \mathbb{R} , i.e., $\mathcal{A} = C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$. Take $f * g = f' g'$ and $N = \varphi I$, where $\varphi \in \mathcal{A}$. Then $E_p^1 = T_p \mathbb{R}$ if $\varphi(p) \neq 0$ and $E_p^1 = \{0\}$ otherwise, so the distribution need not to be regular. We have

$$f \widetilde{*}_N g = \varphi f' g' + \varphi' (f' g + f g')$$

and $T_N\mu(f, g) = \varphi' \varphi' f g$. For instance, if $\varphi(p) = p^2$ (non-regular case), then

$$T_N\mu(f, g) = 4\varphi f g,$$

i.e., N is not Nijenhuis but satisfies the assumptions of the Theorem. We get

$$f *_N g = f \widetilde{*}_N g + N^{-1}(T_N\mu(f, g)) = \varphi f' g' + \varphi'(f' g + f g') + 4f g.$$

Example 3. It is easy to see that if $*$ is an associative product, the multiplication by any $K \in \mathcal{A}$:

$$N_K : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}, \quad N_K(X) = KX,$$

is a Nijenhuis tensor. In view of Remark 4, the corresponding contraction yields

$$X *_N Y = X * K * Y.$$

This product has been recently used as an alternative product of operators in Quantum Mechanics in connection with deformed oscillators [MMSZ], taking up an old idea of Wigner [Wi].

Example 4. Another alternative product for Quantum Mechanics can be constructed as a contraction as follows (cf. [CGM]). Let now the algebra \mathcal{A} be the algebra of $n \times n$ matrices, $n = 1, 2, \dots, \infty$. In the case $n = \infty$ we consider infinite matrices concentrated on the diagonal, i.e., matrices which are null outside a strip of the diagonal. The algebra \mathcal{A} represents then unbounded operators on a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with a common dense domain. We choose \mathcal{A}_1 to be a subalgebra of upper-triangular matrices and for \mathcal{A}_2 we take the supplementary algebra of strict lower-triangular matrices. Then, the mapping

$$N_\alpha(A) = (1 - \alpha)A_1 + \alpha A \tag{18}$$

is a Nijenhuis tensor on \mathcal{A} for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$. For example, for $n = 2$, the new associative matrix multiplication has the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \circ \begin{pmatrix} a' & b' \\ c' & d' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} aa' + \alpha bc' & ab' + bd' \\ ca' + dc' & dd' + \alpha cb' \end{pmatrix}. \tag{19}$$

Note that the unit matrix I remains the unit for this new product and that inner derivations given by diagonal matrices are the same for both products.

Since the corresponding deformed associative products $*_{N_\alpha}$ give all the same result if one of factors is a diagonal matrix, in the infinite case $n = \infty$ the Hamiltonian H for the harmonic oscillator, $H |e_n\rangle = n |e_n\rangle$, describes the same motion for all deformed brackets. This time, however, $a^\dagger *_N a = \alpha H$, so a^\dagger and a commute for $\alpha = 0$.

4 Hierarchy of contractions

Let us have a look at the process of constructing contracted products in a more systematic way. For, denote the linear space of all bilinear products on \mathcal{A} by \mathcal{B} , the linear subspace of all bilinear products μ such that $\mu(X, Y) \in N^k(\mathcal{A}^1)$ by \mathcal{B}_k^1 . Note that the

distribution E^1 associated with the (1,1)-tensor field N (N will be fixed) is the same for all positive powers of N . Let $A_N, B_N, C_N : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be given by

$$(A_N \mu)(X, Y) = N(\mu(X, Y)) , \quad (20)$$

$$(B_N \mu)(X, Y) = \mu(N(X), Y) , \quad (21)$$

$$(C_N \mu)(X, Y) = \mu(X, N(Y)) . \quad (22)$$

It is easy to see that A_N, B_N, C_N generate a commutative algebra of linear operators on \mathcal{B} for which \mathcal{B}_k^1 are invariant subspaces. Moreover, $A_{N^k} = (A_N)^k$, etc. Observe that for the derived product,

$$(\delta_N \mu)(X, Y) = \mu(N(X), Y) + \mu(X, N(Y)) - N(\mu(X, Y)) ,$$

we can write

$$\delta_N = B_N + C_N - A_N ,$$

and for the Nijenhuis torsion,

$$(T_N \mu)(X, Y) = \mu(N(X), N(Y)) - N(\delta_N \mu(X, Y)) ,$$

we can write

$$T_N = B_N C_N - A_N \delta_N = (A_N - B_N)(A_N - C_N) .$$

The contracted product $D_N \mu$ is defined via the formula

$$\mu_N = D_N \mu = \delta_N \mu + \tau_N \mu ,$$

where $\tau_N \mu \in \mathcal{B}^1$ is such that $A_N \tau_N \mu = T_N \mu$. Hence

$$A_N D_N \mu = (A_N \delta_N + T_N) \mu = B_N C_N \mu. \quad (23)$$

If we use N^k instead of N , we can define the corresponding contracted product $D_{N^k} \mu$ if only $T_{N^k} \mu \in \mathcal{B}_k^1$. If this is the case, we call such (1,1)-tensor field N a *strong Saletan tensor* (for μ). We have the following:

Theorem 6 *If N is regular (e.g. E is over a single point) and $T_N \mu$ takes values in \mathcal{A}^1 (i.e., N is a Saletan tensor), then N is a strong Saletan tensor.*

Proof.- Indeed, in this case,

$$T_{N^k} \mu = (A_N^k - B_N^k)(A_N^k - C_N^k) = \omega(A_N, B_N, C_N) (A_N - B_N)(A_N - C_N) \mu ,$$

where ω is a polynomial and $(A_N - B_N)(A_N - C_N) \mu = T_N \mu \in \mathcal{B}_0^1$, since N is a Saletan tensor. We have then $T_{N^k} \mu \in \mathcal{B}_0^1$, since \mathcal{B}_0^1 is an invariant subspace with respect to A_N, B_N, C_N . But in the regular case $N^k(\mathcal{A}^1) = \mathcal{A}^1$ (Theorem 3), so $\mathcal{B}_0^1 = \mathcal{B}_k^1$. \square

There is a nice algebraic condition which assures that the tensor is regular.

Theorem 7 *Suppose that there is a finite-dimensional N -invariant subspace V in \mathcal{A} which generates \mathcal{A} as a $C^\infty(M)$ -module, i.e., the sections from V span the bundle E . Then the tensor N is regular and it is a strong Saletan tensor if and only if its Nijenhuis torsion takes values in \mathcal{A}^1 .*

Proof.- Let $V = V_1 \oplus V_2$ be the Riesz decomposition of V with respect to N (as acting on V). Since $N^k(V_2) = \{0\}$ for a sufficiently large k , $V_2 \subset \mathcal{A}_2$. Similarly, since $N(V_1) = V_1$, $V_1 \subset \mathcal{A}_1$. Since V generates E , we have the decomposition $E(p) = V_1(p) \oplus V_2(p)$ for any $p \in M$. By the dimension argument, $V_2(p) = E_2(p)$ for every $p \in M$, so E^2 is a smooth distribution and its dimension is constant due to Theorem 1. \square

For Nijenhuis tensors we have the following.

Theorem 8 *If N is a Nijenhuis tensor for the product μ and w, v are polynomials, then $w(N)$ is a Nijenhuis tensor for $\delta_{v(N)}\mu$.*

Proof.- N is a Nijenhuis tensor for μ , so $T_N\mu = 0$. Since $A_{w(N)} = w(A_N)$, etc., we have

$$T_{w(N)}\delta_{v(N)}\mu = \delta_{v(N)}W(A_N, B_N, C_N)\mu,$$

where

$$W(x, y, z) = (w(x) - w(y))(w(x) - w(z)) = W_1(x, y, z)(x - y)(x - z)$$

for certain polynomial W_1 . Hence,

$$T_{w(N)}\delta_{v(N)}\mu = \delta_{v(N)}W_1(A_N, B_N, C_N)T_N\mu = 0.$$

\square

For any strong Saletan tensor N we get a whole hierarchy of contracted products

$$D_{N^k}\mu = \delta_{N^k}\mu + \tau_{N^k}\mu, \quad k = 1, 2, \dots$$

We will show that this is exactly the same hierarchy if we apply the contraction procedure inductively:

$$\mu_0 = \mu, \quad \mu_{k+1} = D_N\mu_k.$$

For the case of Nijenhuis tensors, it is very easy. Indeed, as above, N^k are Nijenhuis tensors for μ for any $k = 1, 2, \dots$ and $D_{N^k}\mu = \delta_{N^k}\mu$. To see that $\delta_{N^k}\mu = (\delta_N)^k\mu$, it is sufficient to check that

$$(\delta_{N^k} - (\delta_N)^k)\mu = ((B_N^k + C_N^k - A_N^k) - (B_N + C_N - A_N)^k)\mu = 0.$$

But the polynomial $(x^k + y^k - z^k) - (x + y - z)^k$ vanishes for $x = z$ and for $y = z$, so that it can be written in the form $\omega(x, y, z)(z - x)(z - y)$. Hence,

$$(\delta_{N^k} - (\delta_N)^k)\mu = \omega(A_N, B_N, C_N)(A_N - B_N)(A_N - C_N)\mu = 0,$$

since $(A_N - B_N)(A_N - C_N)\mu = 0$. For an arbitrary strong Saletan tensor the situation is a little bit more complicated. First, we show the following:

Lemma 1 *With the previous notation, for any strong Saletan tensor and any couple of natural numbers $i, k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have*

$$T_{N^i}D_{N^k}\mu = A_N^i(D_{N^{k+i}}\mu - \delta_{N^i}D_{N^k}\mu). \quad (24)$$

Proof.- First of all, let us observe that both sides belong to \mathcal{B}_0^1 .
Indeed, the left hand side equals

$$T_{N^i}(\delta_{N^k}\mu + \tau_{N^k}\mu) = \delta_{N^k}T_{N^i}\mu + T_{N^i}\tau_{N^k}\mu ,$$

and $T_{N^i}\mu, \tau_{N^k}\mu \in \mathcal{B}_0^1$, so the left hand side also belongs to \mathcal{B}_0^1 , due to the invariance of \mathcal{B}_0^1 . As for the right hand side, we write

$$A_N^i(D_{N^{k+i}}\mu - \delta_{N^i}D_{N^k}\mu) = A_N^i(\delta_{N^{k+i}}\mu - \delta_{N^i}\delta_{N^k}\mu + \tau_{N^{k+i}}\mu - \delta_{N^i}\tau_{N^k}\mu) .$$

Since, similarly as above, $\tau_{N^{k+i}}\mu$ and $\delta_{N^i}\tau_{N^k}\mu$ belong to \mathcal{B}_0^1 , it suffices to check that

$$(\delta_{N^{k+i}} - \delta_{N^i}\delta_{N^k})\mu \in \mathcal{B}_0^1 ,$$

which is straightforward, since

$$\begin{aligned} (\delta_{N^{k+i}} - \delta_{N^i}\delta_{N^k})\mu &= (B_N^{k+i} + C_N^{k+i} - A_N^{k+i} - (B_N^i + C_N^i - A_N^i)(B_N^k + C_N^k - A_N^k))\mu \\ &= \omega(A_N, B_N, C_N)(A_N - B_N)(A_N - C_N)\mu = \omega(A_N, B_N, C_N)T_N\mu \in \mathcal{B}_0^1 , \end{aligned}$$

where we use an analogous polynomial factor argument as above and the invariance of \mathcal{B}_0^1 . Hence, we can check the following by applying A_N^k to both sides of (24) (A_N is invertible on E^1):

$$A_N^k T_{N^i} D_{N^k} \mu = A_N^{i+k} (D_{N^{i+k}} \mu - \delta_{N^i} D_{N^k} \mu) .$$

Writing down expressions for $D_{N^k}\mu$ and $D_{N^{k+i}}\mu$ explicitly, and using

$$A_N^k D_{N^k} \mu = (A_N^k \delta_N^k + T_{N^k})\mu = B_N^k C_N^k \mu ,$$

etc., we get

$$A_N^k T_{N^i} D_{N^k} \mu = T_{N^i} B_N^k C_N^k \mu = (B_N^i C_N^i - \delta_{N^i} A_N^i) B_N^k C_N^k \mu \quad (25)$$

$$= (B_N^{i+k} C_N^{i+k} - A_N^i \delta_{N^i} B_N^k C_N^k) \mu \quad (26)$$

$$= A_N^{i+k} (D_{N^{i+k}} \mu - \delta_{N^i} D_{N^k} \mu) .$$

□

Corollary 1 *The tensor N is a strong Saletan tensor for any of $D_{N^k}\mu$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$*

Theorem 9 *If N is a strong Saletan tensor for μ , then*

- i) We have a well-defined hierarchy of contracted products $D_{N^k}\mu$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$*
- ii) N is a strong Saletan tensor for every $D_{N^k}\mu$, $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$*
- iii) $D_{N^i} D_{N^k} \mu = D_{N^{i+k}} \mu$, for any couple of natural numbers $i, k \in \mathbb{N}$.*
- iv) N^k is a homomorphism of the product $D_{N^{i+k}} \mu$ into $D_{N^i} \mu$, for any couple of natural numbers $i, k \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Proof.- We get *i)* by definition and *ii)* is just the Corollary above. To prove *iii)*, let us write (24) from Lemma 1 in the form

$$\tau_{N^i} D_{N^k} \mu = D_{N^{k+i}} \mu - \delta_{N^i} D_{N^k} \mu .$$

Hence,

$$D_{N^{k+i}} \mu = \delta_{N^i} D_{N^k} \mu + \tau_{N^i} D_{N^k} \mu = D_{N^i} D_{N^k} \mu .$$

Finally, *iv)* is straightforward. By the result of Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned} N^i(D_{N^{k+i}} \mu(X, Y)) &= (A_N^i D_{N^{k+i}} \mu)(X, Y) = (A_N^i \delta_{N^i} + T_{N^i}) D_{N^k} \mu(X, Y) \\ &= B_N^i C_N^i D_{N^k} \mu(X, Y) = D_{N^k} \mu(N^i(X), N^i(Y)) . \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

□

Corollary 2 *For any strong Saletan tensor N for μ ,*

i) $N^k(\mathcal{A})$ is a subalgebra with respect to the product $D_{N^i} \mu$;

ii) $\ker N^k = \{X \in \mathcal{A} \mid N^k(X) = 0\}$ is an ideal of $D_{N^i} \mu$, for all $i > k$.

5 Behaviour of properties of algebraic structures under contraction

Assume that our product μ is a specific one, satisfying some general axioms $\{(a_\mu^i)\}$ of the form

$$(a_\mu^i) \quad \forall x_1, \dots, x_{n_i} \in \mathcal{A} \quad [w_\mu^i(x_1, \dots, x_{n_i}) = 0], \quad (28)$$

where w_μ^i are μ -polynomial functions, and using only universal quantifiers, like

$$(a_\mu^1) \quad \forall x, y, z, \in \mathcal{A} \quad [\mu(x, \mu(y, z)) + \mu(y, \mu(z, x)) + \mu(z, \mu(x, y)) = 0],$$

or

$$(a_\mu^2) \quad \forall x, y \in \mathcal{A} \quad [\mu(x, y) + \mu(y, x) = 0] ,$$

or

$$(a_\mu^3) \quad \forall x, y, z \in \mathcal{A} \quad [\mu(x, \mu(y, z)) - \mu(\mu(x, y), z) = 0] ,$$

but not using existential quantifiers like

$$(a_\mu^4) \quad \exists 1 \in \mathcal{A} \forall y \in \mathcal{A} \quad [\mu(1, y) = y = \mu(y, 1)] .$$

An algebra satisfying (a_μ^1) and (a_μ^2) is a Lie algebra, an algebra satisfying (a_μ^3) is associative, and (a_μ^4) says that \mathcal{A} is unital.

Theorem 10 *If the product μ satisfies axioms of the form (28), then the contracted product μ_N satisfies these axioms.*

Proof.- The products $\mu_N^\lambda = U(\lambda)^{-1} \circ \mu \circ U(\lambda)^{\otimes 2}$ are isomorphic to μ , so that they satisfy the same axioms, and equations $w_{\mu_N^\lambda}^i(x_1, \dots, x_{n_i}) = 0$ are going to $w_{\mu_N}^i(x_1, \dots, x_{n_i}) = 0$ by passing to the limit as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$. \square

Remark. The above theorem implies that a contraction of a Lie algebra is a Lie algebra and a contraction of an associative algebra is an associative algebra. However, it is crucial that the axioms use the universal quantifiers only. For example, the existence of unity (a_μ^4) is, in general, not preserved by contractions as shows the case $N = 0$. This is because the unit for the product μ_N^λ is $U(\lambda)^{-1}(1)$ which may have no limit as $\lambda \rightarrow 0$.

Definition. We say that products μ, μ' satisfying axioms (28) are *compatible*, if any linear combination $\mu + \alpha\mu'$ satisfies these axioms. For instance, two associative products are compatible if and only if its sum is associative as well, etc.

Theorem 11 *If N is a Nijenhuis tensor for μ , then the products μ and $\mu_N = \delta_N \mu$ are compatible.*

Proof.- According to Theorem 3, $I + \alpha N$ is a Nijenhuis tensor for μ for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. Using now Theorem 10 we see that the product

$$\mu_{(I+\alpha N)} = \delta_{(I+\alpha N)} \mu = \mu + \alpha \mu_N$$

satisfies the axioms of μ . \square

Remark. If N is only a Saletan tensor, the products μ and μ_N are, in general, not compatible. For example, the associative products $X * Y$ and $X *_N Y = N^{-1}(N(X) * N(Y))$, for invertible N , are in general not compatible, i.e., $X * Y + X *_N Y$ is, in general, not associative.

6 Contractions of Lie algebras

Let us consider now the very important particular case of a finite-dimensional Lie algebra $(E, [\cdot, \cdot])$. This corresponds to the vector bundle E over a single point with $\mathcal{A} = E$ and $\mu = [\cdot, \cdot]$. The family $U(\varepsilon)$ of endomorphisms of the underlying vector space V considered by İnönü and Wigner [IW] is $U(\varepsilon) = P + \varepsilon(I - P)$, where P is a projection, and it was later studied by Saletan [Sa] in the more general case

$$U(\epsilon) = \epsilon I + (1 - \epsilon)N,$$

for which $U(0) = N$ and $U(1) = I$. By reparametrizing it with a new parameter $\lambda = \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}$, it is, as shows Theorem 4, equivalent to the contraction

$$[X, Y]_N = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} U(\lambda)^{-1} [U(\lambda)X, U(\lambda)Y], \quad (29)$$

with $U(\lambda) = \lambda I + N$. In this particular case, the Riesz decomposition $E = E^1 \oplus E^2$ with respect to N is regular and, according to our general Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, the necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of such a limit is that

$$T_N \mu(X, Y) = [NX, NY] - N[NX, Y] - N[X, NY] + N^2[X, Y] \in E^1. \quad (30)$$

Moreover, we obtain the following expression for the new bracket:

$$[X, Y]_N = N|_{E^1}^{-1} [NX, NY]_1 - N[X, Y]_2 + [NX, Y]_2 + [X, NY]_2,$$

where the subscripts refer to the projections onto E^1 or E^2 . Consequently, Theorem 2 implies

$$N[X, Y]_N = [NX, NY] . \quad (31)$$

Therefore, a necessary condition for the existence of a contraction leading from a Lie algebra to become another one is the existence of a Lie algebra homomorphism of the second into the first one. However, as Levy–Nahas pointed out this is not a sufficient condition [LN].

The necessary and sufficient condition as expressed by Gilmore in [Gi]:

the contraction exists if and only if

$$N^{p+s}[X, Y]_2 - N^p[X, N^s Y]_2 = N^s[N^p X, Y]_2 - [N^p X, N^s Y]_2 \quad \text{for all } p, s > 0, \quad (32)$$

can be easily obtained using techniques developed in Section 4. Indeed, in the notation of Section 4, (32) reads

$$(A_N^{p+s} - A_N^p C_N^s) \mu_2 = (A_N^s B_N^p - B_N^p C_N^s) \mu_2, \quad (33)$$

where μ_2 is the projection of the bracket onto E_2 . Since all operators commute among themselves and with the projection, we can write (33) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} (A_N^s - C_N^s)(A_N^p - B_N^p) \mu_2 &= w(A_N, B_N, C_N)((A_N - C_N)(A_N - B_N) \mu)_2 \\ &= w(A_N, B_N, C_N)(T_N \mu)_2 = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which is true for all $p, s > 0$ if and only if $(T_N \mu)_2 = 0$, since the polynomial w equals 1 for $p = s = 1$.

Example 5. Using Theorem 5 we get the İnönü–Wigner contraction for Lie algebras. Consider just a splitting $E = E^1 \oplus E^2$ of the Lie algebra E into a subalgebra E^1 and a complementary subspace E^2 . According to Theorem 5, the projection N of E onto E^1 along E^2 is a Saletan tensor with the splitting being also the Riesz decomposition. The resulting bracket is

$$[X, Y]_N = [X_1, Y_1] + [X_1, Y_2]_2 + [X_2, Y_1]_2. \quad (34)$$

To have a particular example, take $E = \mathfrak{su}(2)$ with the basis X_1, X_2, X_3 satisfying the commutation rules

$$[X_1, X_2] = X_3, \quad [X_2, X_3] = X_1, \quad [X_3, X_1] = X_2. \quad (35)$$

As for E^1 , take the 1-dimensional subalgebra spanned by X_1 , and let E^2 be spanned by X_2, X_3 . According to (34), the commutation rules for the contracted algebra read

$$[X_1, X_2] = X_3, \quad [X_2, X_3] = 0, \quad [X_3, X_1] = X_2. \quad (36)$$

One recognizes easily the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{e}(2)$ of Euclidean motions in a two-dimensional space.

As there were some contractions that could not be explained neither in the framework of İnönü–Wigner [IW] nor in that of Saletan [Sa], Levy–Nahas proposed a more singular contraction procedure by assuming families $U(\lambda) = \lambda^p U_s(\lambda)$, where $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $U_s(\lambda) = N + \lambda I$. Following a quite similar path to that of Saletan contractions, one obtains as a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of the limit in the $p = 1$ case,

$$N(T_N(X, Y)_2) = 0, \quad (37)$$

where

$$T_N(X, Y)_2 = [NX, NY]_2 - N[X, NY]_2 - N[NX, Y]_2 + N^2[X, Y]_2$$

is the projection of the Nijenhuis torsion onto E^2 (cf. with the condition $T_N(X, Y)_2 = 0$ in the standard case). The new bracket is then $T_N(X, Y)_2$. For general p , the condition for the existence of the contraction is $N^p(T_N(X, Y)_2) = 0$, and the resulted bracket is $(-N)^{p-1}T_N(X, Y)_2$.

For the sake of completeness we will finally mention that other generalized İnönü–Wigner contractions were proposed in [DM] and [WW].

7 Contractions of Lie algebroids

Lie algebroids, which are very common structures in geometry, should be very nice objects for contractions in our sense, since they are, by definition, certain algebra structures on sections of vector bundles. They were introduced by Pradines [Pr] as infinitesimal objects for differentiable groupoids, but one can find similar notions proposed by several authors in increasing number of papers (which proves their importance and naturalness). For basic properties and the literature on the subject we refer to the survey article by Mackenzie [Mac].

Definition 2 *A Lie algebroid on a smooth manifold M is a vector bundle $\tau : E \rightarrow M$, together with a bracket $\mu = [\cdot, \cdot] : \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ on the $C^\infty(M)$ -module $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(E)$ of smooth sections of τ , and a vector bundle morphism $a_\mu : E \rightarrow TM$, over the identity on M , from E to the tangent bundle TM , called the anchor of the Lie algebroid, such that*

- (i) *the bracket μ is a Lie algebra bracket on \mathcal{A} over \mathbb{R} ;*
- (ii) *for all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$ and all smooth functions f on M we have*

$$\mu(X, fY) = f\mu(X, Y) + a_\mu(X)(f)Y; \quad (38)$$

- (iii) *For all $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$,*

$$a_\mu(\mu(X, Y)) = [a_\mu(X), a_\mu(Y)], \quad (39)$$

where the square bracket is the Lie bracket of vector fields. In other words, a_μ is a Lie algebra homomorphism.

Example 6. Every finite-dimensional Lie algebra E is a Lie algebroid as a bundle over a single point with the trivial anchor. More generally, any bundle of Lie algebras is a Lie algebroid with the trivial anchor.

Example 7. There is a canonical Lie algebroid structure on every tangent bundle TM with the bracket being the standard bracket of vector fields and the anchor being just the identity map on TM .

Example 8. There is a natural Lie algebroid associated with a realization of a Lie algebra in terms of vector fields. Suppose V is a Lie algebra with the bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]$ with a realization $\hat{\cdot} : V \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$ in terms of vector fields on a manifold M . We can view V as a subspace of sections on the trivial bundle $E = M \times V$ over M , regarding $X \in V$ as constant sections of E . There is uniquely defined Lie algebroid structure on $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(E) = C^\infty(M, V)$ such that the Lie algebroid bracket μ and the anchor a_μ satisfy:

- (i) $\mu(X, Y) = [X, Y]$ for all $X, Y \in V$;
- (ii) $a_\mu(X) = \hat{X}$ for every $X \in V$.

In other words, identifying \mathcal{A} with $C^\infty(M) \otimes V$, the Lie algebroid bracket reads

$$\mu(f \otimes X, g \otimes Y) = fg \otimes [X, Y] + f\hat{X}(g) \otimes Y - g\hat{Y}(f) \otimes X. \quad (40)$$

Example 9. There is a canonical Lie algebroid structure on the cotangent bundle T^*M associated with a Poisson tensor P on M . This is the unique Lie algebroid bracket $[\cdot, \cdot]^P$ of differential 1-forms for which $[df, dg]^P = d\{f, g\}^P$, where $\{\cdot, \cdot\}^P$ is the Poisson bracket of functions for P , and the anchor map is just P viewed as a bundle morphism $P : T^*M \rightarrow TM$. Explicitly,

$$[\alpha, \beta]^P = \mathcal{L}_{P(\alpha)}\beta - \mathcal{L}_{P(\beta)}\alpha - d\langle P, \alpha \wedge \beta \rangle. \quad (41)$$

This Lie bracket was defined first by Fuchssteiner [Fu]. We shall comment more on this structure in the next section.

It is interesting that any contraction of a Lie algebroid bracket gives again a Lie algebroid bracket. We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 2 *If μ is a Lie algebroid bracket on $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(E)$ and $a_\mu : E \rightarrow TM$ is the corresponding anchor, then for any $(1, 1)$ -tensor N on E we have*

- (i) $\delta_N \mu(X, fY) = f\delta_N \mu(X, Y) + a_\mu(N(X))(f)Y$;
- (ii) $T_N \mu(X, fY) = fT_N \mu(X, Y)$,

for any $X, Y \in \mathcal{A}$, $f \in C^\infty(M)$.

Proof. - (i) By definition and properties of Lie algebroid brackets,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_N \mu(X, fY) &= \mu(N(X), fY) + \mu(X, N(fY)) - N\mu(X, fY) \\ &= f\mu(N(X), Y) + a_\mu(N(X))(f)Y + f\mu(X, N(Y)) \\ &\quad + a_\mu(X)(f)N(Y) - fN\mu(X, Y) + a_\mu(X)(f)N(Y) \\ &= f(\mu(N(X), Y) + \mu(X, N(Y)) - N\mu(X, Y)) + a_\mu(N(X))(f)Y \\ &= f\delta_N \mu(X, Y) + a_\mu(N(X))(f)Y. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the fact that the multiplication by a function commutes with N (i.e., N is a tensor).

(ii) We have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_N\mu(X, fY) &= \mu(N(X), N(fY)) - N\delta_N\mu(X, fY) \\
&= f\mu(N(X), N(Y)) + a_\mu(N(X))(f)N(Y) \\
&\quad - fN\delta_N\mu(X, Y) - a_\mu(N(X))(f)N(Y) \\
&= f(\mu(N(X), N(Y)) - N\delta_N\mu(X, Y)) = fT_N\mu(X, Y),
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used (i). \square

Theorem 12 *If N is a Saletan tensor for a Lie algebroid bracket μ on $\mathcal{A} = \Gamma(E)$, with an anchor map $a_\mu : E \rightarrow TM$, then the contracted bracket μ_N is again a Lie algebroid bracket on \mathcal{A} with the anchor $a_{\mu_N} = a_\mu \circ N$.*

Proof.- We already know that the contracted bracket $\mu_N = \delta_N\mu + \tau_N\mu$ is a Lie bracket. Since N is a Saletan tensor, $\tau_N\mu = N^{-1}T_N\mu$ is well-defined and clearly satisfies also (ii) of the above Lemma. Thus, using also (i),

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_N(X, fY) &= \delta_N\mu(X, fY) + \tau_N\mu(X, fY) \\
&= f\delta_N\mu(X, Y) + a_\mu(N(X))(f)Y + f\tau_N\mu(X, Y) \\
&= f(\delta_N\mu(X, Y) + \tau_N\mu(X, Y)) + a_\mu(N(X))(f)Y \\
&= f\mu_N(X, Y) + a_\mu(N(X))(f)Y,
\end{aligned}$$

so that $a_{\mu_N} = a_\mu \circ N$ can serve for the anchor of μ_N . It suffices to check the condition (39):

$$\begin{aligned}
[a_{\mu_N}(X), a_{\mu_N}(Y)] &= [a_\mu(N(X)), a_\mu(N(Y))] \\
&= a_\mu(\mu(N(X), N(Y))) = a_\mu(N\mu_N(X, Y)).
\end{aligned}$$

We have used the identity $\mu(N(X), N(Y)) = N\mu_N(X, Y)$ which holds for Saletan tensors. \square

Note that this type of contractions of Lie algebroids has been already studied by Kosmann-Schwarzbach and Magri in [KSM] in the case of Nijenhuis tensors. All results of this section can also be applied to general algebroids as defined in [GU].

Example 10. The contracted bracket of vector fields defined in Example 1 defines a new Lie algebroid structure on TM with the anchor map being the projection onto the subbundle E^1 of TM .

Example 11. Any Saletan contraction of a Lie algebra V leads to a contraction of the Lie algebroid associated with an action of V on M , which was described in Example 8. More precisely, if N_0 is a Saletan tensor for V , then

$$N : M \times V \rightarrow M \times V, \quad N(f \otimes X) = f \otimes N_0(X), \quad (42)$$

is a Saletan tensor for the canonical Lie algebroid bracket on $\mathcal{A} = C^\infty(M) \otimes V$. Indeed, if $V = V^1 \oplus V^2$ is the Riesz decomposition for N_0 , then $E = E^1 \oplus E^2$, with $E^i = C^\infty(M) \otimes V^i$, is the Riesz decomposition for N . Moreover, the Nijenhuis torsion $T_N \mu$ takes values in \mathcal{A}^1 . Indeed, by Lemma 2(ii), the Nijenhuis torsion $T_N \mu$ is tensorial, so it suffices to check that on V it takes values in \mathcal{A}^1 . But on V the Nijenhuis torsion of N with respect to μ is the same as the Nijenhuis torsion of N_0 with respect to the bracket on V , so it takes values in $V^1 \subset \mathcal{A}^1$. Finally, E^1 is of constant rank, so N is regular and hence a Saletan tensor due to Theorem 3. The anchor map for μ_N is $a_\mu \circ N$, so $a_{\mu_N}(f \otimes X) = \widehat{f N_0(X)}$ and the contracted anchor takes values in the module of vector fields generated by the action of the subalgebra $N_0(V)$ on M . In fact, what we get is the Lie algebroid structure on $M \times V$ associated with the contracted Lie algebra structure on V and the anchor map $a_\mu \circ N$.

As a particular example let us take the Lie algebroid on $S^2 \times \mathfrak{su}(2)$ associated with the action of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ on the 2-dimensional sphere $S^2 = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3 : x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 1\}$ given by (in the notation of Example 5)

$$\hat{X}_1 = y\partial_z - z\partial_y, \quad \hat{X}_2 = x\partial_z - z\partial_x, \quad \hat{X}_3 = x\partial_y - y\partial_x. \quad (43)$$

From the contraction of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ into $\mathfrak{e}(2)$, as described in Example 5, we construct a contraction of this Lie algebroid. For the Lie bracket we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_N \left(\sum f_i \otimes X_i, \sum g_j \otimes X_j \right) &= (f_1 \hat{X}_1(g_1) - g_1 \hat{X}_1(f_1)) \otimes X_1 \\ &\quad + (f_3 g_1 - f_1 g_3 + f_1 \hat{X}_1(g_2) - g_1 \hat{X}_1(f_2)) \otimes X_2 \\ &\quad + (f_1 g_2 - f_2 g_1 + f_1 \hat{X}_1(g_3) - g_1 \hat{X}_1(f_3)) \otimes X_3 \end{aligned}$$

and the anchor reads

$$a_{\mu_N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^3 f_i \otimes X_i \right) = f_1 \hat{X}_1. \quad (44)$$

This is the Lie algebroid structure on $S^2 \times \mathfrak{e}(2)$ associated with the representation $\widehat{(X_i)_N} = \delta_1^i \hat{X}_1$ of $\mathfrak{e}(2)$ in terms of vector fields on S^2 .

8 Poisson contractions

Poisson brackets, being defined on functions, are brackets of sections of 1-dimensional bundles and seem, at the first sight, not to go under our contraction procedures. We shall show that this is not true and that our contraction method shows precisely what contraction of a Poisson tensor should be. The crucial point is that we should think about a Poisson tensor P on M as defining certain Lie algebroid structure on T^*M rather than defining just the Poisson bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}^P$ on functions. Recall from Example 9 that the Lie algebroid bracket on differential forms, associated with P , reads

$$[\alpha, \beta]^P = \mathcal{L}_{P(\alpha)}\beta - \mathcal{L}_{P(\beta)}\alpha - d\langle P, \alpha \wedge \beta \rangle. \quad (45)$$

The anchor map of this Lie algebroid is just P , viewed as a bundle morphism $P : T^*M \rightarrow TM$, so that P can be easily decoded from the Lie algebroid structure. Of

course, not all Lie algebroid structures on T^*M , even having a Poisson tensor for the anchor map, are of this kind. We just mention that an elegant characterization of Lie algebroid brackets associated with Poisson structures is that the exterior derivative acts as a graded derivative on the corresponding Schouten-like bracket of differential forms, or that this Lie algebroid structure constitutes a *Lie bialgebroid* (in the sense of Mackenzie and Xu [MX]) together with the canonical Lie algebroid structure on the dual, i.e., the tangent bundle TM .

One can think differently. Suppose we have a skew-symmetric 2-vector field P , viewed as a bundle morphism $P : T^*M \rightarrow TM$, and we write formally the bracket (45). When do we obtain a Lie algebroid bracket? The answer is very simple (cf. [KSM]):

Theorem 13 *If P is a skew 2-vector field, then formula (45) gives a Lie algebroid bracket if and only if P is a Poisson tensor.*

Let us fix now a Poisson structure P on M and the Lie algebroid bracket $\mu^P = [\cdot, \cdot]^P$. Given Saletan tensor N for μ^P , we get the contracted bracket μ_N^P . It is natural, in the case when μ_N^P is again a Lie algebroid bracket associated with a Poisson tensor (we shall speak about *Poisson contraction*), to call this tensor a *contracted Poisson structure* by means of N . By tN we shall denote the dual bundle morphism of $N : T^*M \rightarrow T^*M$. In particular, ${}^tN : TM \rightarrow TM$. We almost follow the notation of [MM, KSM] but with exchanged roles for N and tN which, as it will be seen later, seems to be more appropriate in our case.

Theorem 14 *A necessary and sufficient condition for the contraction of the Lie algebroid μ^P associated with a Saletan tensor N to be a Poisson contraction is that*

$$(i) \quad PN = {}^tNP$$

and

$$(ii) \quad \mu_N^P = \mu^{PN}.$$

Proof. First, assume that the contraction according to N is a Poisson contraction. Hence, $\mu_N^P = \mu^{P_1}$ for a Poisson tensor P_1 . But the anchor of μ^{P_1} is P_1 and the anchor of μ_N^P is PN (Theorem 12). We get then $P_1 = PN$ and (ii). Since PN must be skew-symmetric, ${}^t(PN) = -PN$. But ${}^t(PN) = {}^tN{}^tP = -{}^tNP$ and we get (i).

Suppose now (i) and (ii). Since (i) means that PN is skew-symmetric and μ_N^P is a Lie algebroid bracket, in view of Theorem 13, the tensor PN is a Poisson tensor. \square

Remark. Bihamiltonian systems, as noticed by Magri [Mag], play an important role in the discussion of complete integrability in the sense of Liouville. A geometrical approach to this questions, proposed in [MM] (see also [KSM]), uses the notion of a *Poisson-Nijenhuis structure*, i.e., a pair (P, N) , where P is a Poisson tensor on M and N is a Nijenhuis tensor on the tangent bundle TM , which satisfy certain compatibility conditions. For contractions of μ^P , we use N being a morphism of T^*M rather than of TM , but of course, by duality, ${}^tN : TM \rightarrow TM$.

In the case when N is a Nijenhuis tensor for μ^P , our conditions (i) and (ii) are the same as the compatibility conditions for Poisson-Nijenhuis structure of [MM, KSM] with N replaced by tN . In this case $\mu^{PN} - \mu_N^P$ is exactly what in [KSM] is denoted by $C(P, {}^tN)$. Note that Poisson-Nijenhuis structures can be described in terms of Lie bialgebroids [KS] (cf. also [GU1] for a more general setting).

We do not assume that tN (in our notation) is a Nijenhuis tensor for the canonical Lie algebroid TM , but that N is a Saletan tensor for μ^P on T^*M . It is natural to call a pair (P, N) , where P is a Poisson structure on M and N is a Saletan tensor for μ^P satisfying (i) and (ii) of the above theorem, a *Poisson-Saletan structure*. If (P, N) is a Poisson-Saletan structure, then $(P, {}^tN)$ need not be a Poisson-Nijenhuis structure in the sense of [KSM], even if we impose that N is a Nijenhuis tensor for μ^P , as shows the following example. However, this weaker assumption is sufficient to perform a Poisson contraction and to obtain the contracted Poisson structure PN . In the case when N is a Nijenhuis tensor for μ^P , according to Theorem 11, Lie algebroid brackets μ^P and $\mu_N^P = \mu^{PN}$ are compatible, so also the Poisson tensors P and PN are compatible. We can also get a whole hierarchy of compatible Poisson tensors using the results of Section 4.

Example 12. Let $M = M_1 \times M_2$, where M_i , $i = 1, 2$, is a manifold. On the product manifold consider the product Poisson structure $P = P_1 \times \{0\}$, where P_1 is a Poisson structure on M_1 . Let $N_2 : T^*M_2 \rightarrow T^*M_2$ be any $(1 - 1)$ -tensor on M_2 . It induces a tensor $N : T^*M \rightarrow T^*M$ which on

$$T_{(m_1, m_2)}^*M = T_{m_1}^*M_1 \oplus T_{m_2}^*M_2 \quad (46)$$

acts by identity on $T_{m_1}^*M_1$ and by $(N_2)_{m_2}$ on $T_{m_2}^*M_2$. The $C^\infty(M)$ -module $\Omega^1(M)$ of 1-forms on M is generated by $\Omega^1(M_1)$ and $\Omega^1(M_2)$ and, as can be easily seen from (45), $\mu^P(\alpha, \beta) = \mu^{P_1}(\alpha, \beta)$ for $\alpha, \beta \in \Omega^1(M_1)$, and $\mu^P(\alpha, \beta) = 0$ when $\alpha \in \Omega^1(M_2)$. Since $\Omega^1(M_1)$ and $\Omega^1(M_2)$ are invariant subspaces for N , and since N acts by identity on $\Omega^1(M_1)$, it follows that N is a Nijenhuis tensor for μ^P and that $\mu_N^P = \mu^P = \mu^{PN}$. Thus (P, N) is a Poisson-Saletan structure. On the other hand, ${}^tN = id \times {}^tN_2$ need not to be a Nijenhuis tensor for TM , since N_2 is arbitrary.

However, we have the following weaker result.

Theorem 15 *If $N : T^*M \rightarrow T^*M$ is a Nijenhuis tensor for μ^P , then the Nijenhuis torsion of ${}^tN : TM \rightarrow TM$ vanishes on the vector fields from the image of $P : T^*M \rightarrow TM$. In particular, if P is invertible, i.e., comes from a symplectic structure, then $(P, {}^tN)$ is a Poisson-Nijenhuis structure in the sense of [KSM].*

Proof.- Writing down $T_N\mu^P = 0$, we get

$$\mu^P(N(\alpha), N(\beta)) = N(\mu^P(N(\alpha), \beta) + \mu^P(\alpha, N(\beta)) - N\mu^P(\alpha, \beta)). \quad (47)$$

Applying the anchor P to both sides, we get, according to (39),

$$[PN(\alpha), PN(\beta)] = PN(\mu^P(N(\alpha), \beta) + \mu^P(\alpha, N(\beta)) - N\mu^P(\alpha, \beta)). \quad (48)$$

Using now $PN = {}^tNP$ and the fact that anchor is a homomorphism of the brackets once more, we get

$$[{}^tNP(\alpha), {}^tNP(\beta)] = {}^tN([{}^tNP(\alpha), P(\beta)] + [P(\alpha), {}^tNP(\beta)] - {}^tN[P(\alpha), P(\beta)]). \quad (49)$$

The last means exactly that

$$T_{{}^tN}(P(\alpha), P(\beta)) = 0, \quad (50)$$

where T_{tN} is the Nijenhuis torsion of tN with respect to the bracket of vector fields. \square

Remark. The property (50), together with the compatibility condition, defines a *week Poisson-Nijenhuis structure* in the terminology of [MMP]. That this week condition is sufficient to get recursion operators was first observed in [MN]. Note also that a similar procedure can be applied to Jacobi structures. Jacobi structures give rise to Lie algebroids as was observed in [KSB]. Similarly as above, the contraction procedures for these Lie algebroids give rise to a proper concept of a *Jacobi-Nijenhuis structure*. We refer to [MMP] for details.

9 Contractions of n -ary products and coproducts

Let, as before, N be a $(1,1)$ -tensor over a vector bundle E , $E = E^1 \oplus E^2$ be the Riesz decomposition of E relative to N , and $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}^1$ be the spaces of smooth sections of E and E^1 , respectively. In complete analogy with binary products, we can consider n -ary products (resp. coproducts), i.e., linear mappings $\mu : \mathcal{A}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ (resp. linear mappings $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\otimes n}$) and contractions of them with respect to families $U(\lambda) = \lambda I + N$. For an n -ary product (resp. coproduct) we denote

$$\delta_N \mu = \mu \circ N_n^{n-1} - N \circ \mu \circ N_n^{n-2} + \dots + (-1)^{n-1} N^{n-1} \circ \mu \circ N_n^0,$$

and, respectively,

$$\delta_N \mu = N_n^{n-1} \circ \mu - N_n^{n-2} \circ \mu \circ N + \dots + (-1)^{n-1} N_n^0 \circ \mu \circ N^{n-1},$$

where N_n^k are defined by

$$(\lambda I + N)^{\otimes n} = \sum_{k=0}^n \lambda^{n-k} N_n^k.$$

An obvious adaptation of the proof of Theorem 2 gives the following.

Theorem 16 *Let $\mu : \mathcal{A}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a point-wise continuous n -ary product in \mathcal{A} . Then, for $U(\lambda) = \lambda I + N$, the limit*

$$\mu_N = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} (U(\lambda)^{-1} \circ \mu \circ U(\lambda)^{\otimes n})$$

exists and defines a new (contracted) n -ary product $D_N \mu$ on \mathcal{A} if and only if the Nijenhuis torsion

$$T_N \mu = \mu \circ N^{\otimes n} - N \circ \delta_N \mu$$

takes values in $N(\mathcal{A}^1)$. If this is the case, then

$$\mu_N = \delta_N \mu + \tau_N \mu, \tag{51}$$

where $N(\tau_N \mu) = T_N \mu$. Moreover, N constitutes a homomorphism of (\mathcal{A}, μ_N) into (\mathcal{A}, μ) :

$$N \circ \mu_N = \mu \circ N^{\otimes n}.$$

A similar theorem for coproducts can be obtained by duality. Since it is much harder to put conditions for existence of contraction at arguments of the Nijenhuis torsion, for simplicity we give an explicit version for the regular case only.

Theorem 17 *Let $\mu : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\otimes n}$ be a point-wise continuous n -ary coproduct in \mathcal{A} . If N is regular, i.e., E^1 is of constant dimension, then, for $U(\lambda) = \lambda I + N$, the limit*

$$\mu_N = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow 0} (U(\lambda)^{\otimes n} \circ \mu \circ U(\lambda)^{-1})$$

exists and defines a new (contracted) n -ary coproduct $D_N\mu$ on \mathcal{A} if and only if the Nijenhuis torsion

$$T_N\mu = N^{\otimes n} \circ \mu - \delta_N\mu \circ N$$

vanishes on \mathcal{A}^2 -the space of sections of E^2 . If this is the case, then

$$\mu_N = \delta_N\mu + \tau_N\mu, \tag{52}$$

where $(\tau_N\mu) = T_N\mu \circ N^{-1}$ on \mathcal{A}^1 and $\tau_N\mu = 0$ on \mathcal{A}^2 . Moreover, N constitutes a homomorphism of (\mathcal{A}, μ_N) into (\mathcal{A}, μ) :

$$\mu_N \circ N = N^{\otimes n} \circ \mu .$$

One can consider more general algebraic structures of the form $\mu : \mathcal{A}^{\otimes k} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\otimes n}$, but this leads to more conditions of contractibility and we will not study these cases in the present paper. Note only that contractions of coproducts, as a part of contractions of Lie bialgebras, appeared already in [BGHOS].

10 Conclusions

Motivated by physical examples from Quantum Mechanics, we have studied contractions of general binary (or n -ary) products with respect to one-parameter families of transformations of the form $U(\lambda) = \lambda A + N$, generalizing pioneering work by İnönü, Wigner, and Saletan. Our generalization can be applied to many infinite-dimensional cases, especially Lie algebroids and Poisson brackets, however, it does not deal with a generic dependence of the contraction parameter. The problem of describing contractions with respect to general $U(\lambda)$, or even differentiable with respect to λ , is much more complicated.

The contraction procedure can be viewed as an inverse of a deformation procedure. Deformations of associative and Lie algebras, at least on the infinitesimal level, are related to some cohomology. It would be interesting to relate formally deformations to contractions and connect the cohomology also to contractions.

We postpone these problems to a separate paper.

References

- [BGHOS] Ballesteros A.; Gromov N. A.; Herranz F. J.; del Olmo M. A. and Santander M., *Lie bialgebra contractions and quantum deformations*, J. Math. Phys. **36** (1995), 5916–5937.

- [CGM] Cariñena, J. F.; Grabowski, J. and Marmo, G., *Quantum bihamiltonian systems*, to appear in Int. J. Mod. Phys. A.
- [Di] Dirac, P.A.M., *The Principles of Quantum Mechanics*, Oxford University Press, 1958.
- [DM] Doebner H.D. and Melsheimer O. *On a Class of Generalized Group Contractions* Il Nuovo Cimento **49** (1967), 306–311.
- [Fu] Fuchssteiner B., *The Lie algebra structure of degenerate Hamiltonian and bi-Hamiltonian systems*, Progr. Theoret. Phys. **68** (1982), 1082–1104.
- [Gi] Gilmore R., *Lie Groups, Lie Algebras, and Some of their Applications*, John Wiley & Sons, 1974.
- [GU] Grabowski J. and Urban̓ski P., *Algebroids – general differential calculi on vector bundles*, J. Geom. Phys. **31** (1999), 111–141.
- [GU1] Grabowski J. and Urban̓ski P., *Lie algebroids and Poisson-Nijenhuis structures*, Rep. Math. Phys. **40** (1997), 195–208.
- [IW] İnönü E. and Wigner E.P., *On the contraction of Groups and their representations*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **39** (1953), 510–524.
- [KS] Kosmann-Schwarzbach Y., *The Lie bialgebroid of a Poisson-Nijenhuis manifold*, Lett. Math. Phys. **38** (1996), 421–428.
- [KSB] Kerbat Y. and Souici-Benhammadi Z., *Variétés de Jacobi et groupoïdes de contact*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér., I **317** (1993), 81–86.
- [KSM] Kosmann-Schwarzbach Y. and Magri F., *Poisson-Nijenhuis structures*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Phys. Theor. **53** (1990), 35–81.
- [LN] Levy-Nahas M., *Deformation and Contraction of Lie Algebras*, J. Math. Phys. **8** (1967), 1211–1222.
- [Mac] Mackenzie K. C. H., *Lie algebroids and Lie pseudoalgebras*, Bull. London Mat. Soc. **27** (1995), 97–147.
- [MX] Mackenzie K. C. H. and Xu P., *Lie bialgebroids and Poisson groupoids*, Duke Math. J. **73** (1994), 415–452.
- [Mag] Magri, F., *A simple model of the integrable Hamiltonian equation*, J. Math. Phys. **19** (1978), 1156–52.
- [MM] Magri F. and Morosi C., *A geometrical characterization of integrable Hamiltonian systems through the theory of Poisson-Nijenhuis manifolds*, Quaderno S19, University of Milan, 1984.
- [MN] Marle C.-M. and Nunes da Costa J. M., *Reduction of bihamiltonian manifolds and recursion operators*, in: Diff. Geom. Appl. (Brno 1995), Masaryk Univ., Brno 1996, 523–538.

- [MMP] Marrero J. C.; Monterde J. and Padrón E., *Jacobi-Nijenhuis manifolds and compatible Jacobi structures*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Sér. I, **329** (1999), 797–802.
- [MMSZ] Man'ko, V. I.; Marmo, G.; Sudarshan, E. C. G. and Zaccaria, F., *Wigner's problem and alternative commutation relations for quantum mechanics*, Int. Jour. Mod. Phys. B **11** (1997), 1281–1296.
- [Pr] Pradines J., *Théorie de Lie pour les groupoïdes différentiables. Calcul différentiel dans la catégorie des groupoïdes infinitésimaux*, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér A **264** (1967), 245–248.
- [Sa] Saletan E.J., *Contractions of Lie Groups*, J. Math. Phys. **2** (1961), 1–21.
- [WW] Weimar-Woods E., *The three-dimensional real Lie algebras and their contractions*, J. Math. Phys. **32** (1991), 2028–33.
- [Wi] Wigner, E. P., *Do the equations of Motion determine the quantum mechanical commutation relations?*, Phys. Rev. **77** (1950), 711–12.